

REMARKS

Claims 1-21, 32-44, 46-57, and 59 were presented for examination. The instant amendment cancels claims 3, 17, 39, and 54. Thus, claims 1-2, 4-16, 18-21, 32-38, 40-44, 46-53, 55-57, and 59 remain pending upon entry of the instant amendment. Claims 1, 12, 13, 32, and 46 are independent.

Independent claims 1 and 32, as well as claims 2-11 and 33-44 that depend therefrom, respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 over U.S. Patent No. 6,411,865 to Qin et al. (Qin). Independent claims 12, 13, and 46, as well as claims 14-21, 44, 46-57, and 59 that depend therefrom, respectively, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Qin in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,875,088 to Matsko et al. (Matsko).

Independent claims 1, 12, and 13 have each been amended to recite that the microprocessor performs “said zone protective function” and to recite the step of “controlling said microprocessor to perform instantaneous overcurrent protection of the switching devices based at least in part on said electrical parameters” (emphasis added). Support for this amendment can be found at least at paragraph [0026] of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that Qin does not disclose or suggest that the central unit 20 performs both the “zone protective function” and the “instantaneous overcurrent protection” as now recited in claims 1, 12, and 13.

Matsko not asserted by the Office Action, nor does Matsko disclose or suggest the claimed microprocessor that performs both the “zone protective function” and the “instantaneous overcurrent protection”.

Claims 1, 12, and 13 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-11, 14-16, and 18-21 are also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason that they depend from the aforementioned claims. Reconsideration

and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-2, 4-16, and 18-21 are respectfully requested.

Independent claims 32 and 46 have each been amended to recite that the control processing unit “performs all primary power distribution functions for the circuit power distribution system and performs a zone protective function (emphasis added)”. Support for this amendment can be found at least at paragraph [0026] of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that Qin does not disclose or suggest that the central unit 20 performs both the “zone protective function” and “all primary power distribution functions” as now recited in claims 32 and 46.

Matsko not asserted by the Office Action, nor does Matsko disclose or suggest the claimed microprocessor that performs both the “zone protective function” and “all primary power distribution functions”.

Claims 32 and 46 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 33-38, 40-44, 47-53, 55-57, and 59 are also believed to be in condition for allowance for at least the reason that they depend from the aforementioned claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection to claims 32-38, 40-44, 46-53, 55-57, and 59 are respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Such action is solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner feels that consultation with Applicants' attorney would be helpful in the advancement of the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to call the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

May 31, 2007


Paul D. Greeley
Registration No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401